



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,673	09/29/2003	Aaron Bangor	1033-T00533	2302
60533	7590	10/06/2008	EXAMINER	
TOLER LAW GROUP 8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE SUITE A201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			PHANTANA ANGKOOK, DAVID	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2175			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/06/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,673	Applicant(s) BANGOR ET AL.
	Examiner David Phantana-angkool	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/2/08.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 13, 14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 13, 14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/136/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on July 22nd, 2008
2. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 14 and 16-20 are pending claims.
3. Applicants amended claims 1, 2-6, 8, 11, and 20.
4. Applicants amended claim 1 in response to a 35 USC § 101 rejection cited by the examiner in the previous office action (dated 03/18/2008). Applicants' amendment has addressed the rejection previously made, and therefore, in view of the amendment, 35 USC § 101 rejection is now withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman et al., US PG PUB# 2004/0119761 A1 (hereinafter Grossman) in view of Padwick, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2000" (hereinafter Padwick).**

As for independent claim 1:

Grossman shows messaging system comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

- a processor; a memory device coupled to the processor, the memory device storing instructions for generating a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface operable to present (0036. Grossman shows a processor and memory for generating the UI, user interface);
- an address menu having an identification field with a plurality of associated address fields, each of the plurality of address fields operable to maintain an address for a plurality of messaging receipt options, wherein outgoing message is formatted in a plurality of formats based upon the messaging receipt options (0053, Fig. 7 shows multiple address fields for a messaging receipt option. In Para. 0069 Grossman shows that the user may change the view of the outgoing communication history based on the type of communication. Grossman shows a plurality of messaging options in Para. 0069);
- an address box associated with the outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses (Grossman shows an address box receiving multiple addresses through use of single selector in (Fig. 4# 410, Fig. 5#510, 520, and 530; Para. 0062-0063).

Grossman does not specifically show a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of identification field. In the same field of invention Padwick teaches a selector (Figure 3.32 "To" to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for selecting multiple addresses as shown in "Creating a Message", Pgs. 6, 7, and Figure 3.32 in Padwick and also shown below:




Figure 3.32. The Select Names dialog box shows the names in your Address Book. These names are listed at the left side of the dialog box.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Grossman messaging system to incorporate a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of identification field as taught by Padwick, thus allowing the user to select a plurality of names and addresses from the Message form (Padwick, "Creating a Message", Pg. 6).

As for dependent claim 2:

Grossman-Padwick suggests the system of claim 1 wherein the identification field maintains a contact alias for a potential recipient of the outgoing electronic message (0079). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 1 *supra*)

As for dependent claim 3:

Grossman-Padwick suggests the system of claim 1, wherein the memory device further stores a first address menu for a first user and a second address menu for a second user, and an interface engine associated with the messaging system and operable to communicatively couple a remote computer

Art Unit: 2175

associated with the first user to the messaging system (0014, 0046, 0075). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 1 *supra*).

As for dependent claim 4:

Grossman-Padwick suggests the *system of claim 3 wherein the messaging system is operable to initiate communication of internet protocol packets* (Fig. 4# 450). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 1 *supra*).

As for dependent claim 5:

Grossman-Padwick suggests the *system of claim 3, wherein the remote computer is communicatively coupled to the messaging system via a cable modem* (0075). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 1 *supra*).

As for dependent claim 6:

Grossman-Padwick suggests the *system of claim 1, wherein the address menu further comprises: a first address field associated with the identification field, the first address field for maintaining a first address type of a contact; and a second address field associated with the identification field, the second address field for maintaining a second address type of the contact* (Fig.4 shows different types of contact information associated with a user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 1 *supra*).

8. Claims 11, 13, 14, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman et al., US PG PUB# 2004/0119761 A1 (hereinafter Grossman) in view of Shavit et al., US PG PUB# 2002/0160757 (hereinafter Shavit).

As for independent claim 11:

Grossman shows a messaging method comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

- *initiating presentation of a first user-selectable item for viewing a collection of contact information (Grossman, 0048);*
- *receiving a signal indicating a user selection of the first user-selectable item (Grossman, 0050);*
- *initiating a graphical user interface (GUI) element to present an address menu comprising contact information for at least one potential addressee (Clicking on Fig.4# 470, Para. 0062 will initiate a graphical user interface displaying an address menu to display a plurality of addresses),*

Grossman does not specifically show (1) *the contact information including a first selectable address of a first address type and a second selectable address of a second address type for the at least one potential addressee* (2) *recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address; (3) initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message, wherein the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the first address type for transmission to the first address and the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the second address type for transmission to the second address.* In Paragraph 0053 and Fig. 7,

Grossman shows multiple address fields for a messaging receipt option. In Para. 0069 Grossman shows that the user may change the view of the outgoing communication history based on the type of communication. Furthermore Grossman shows a plurality of messaging options in Para. 0069. In the same field of invention Shavit teaches a contacts database which stores a list of addresses of a potential addressee (Shavit, 0034). Shavit allows the user to configure a priority table to send a message to a desired recipient with a plurality of addresses (Shavit, 0007). Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Grossman messaging system to incorporate (1) *the contact information including a first selectable address and a second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee* (2) *recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address; (3) initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message, wherein the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the first address type for transmission to the first address and the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the second address type for transmission to the second*

Art Unit: 2175

address as taught by Shavit, thus allowing the user to send a message to a desired recipient with a plurality of addresses (Shavit, 0007).

As for dependent claim 13:

Grossman- Shavit suggests the *method of claim 11, further comprising: receiving a signal indicating a request to prepare an outgoing message; and initiating presentation of a messaging graphical user interface (GUI) to present a message composition template comprising an address box and a message input box* (Grossman, Figs 4 and 7, 0059). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the graphical user interface of Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 11, *supra*).

As for dependent claim 14:

Grossman- Shavit suggests the *method of claim 11, further comprising: modifying the address menu in response to a user input comprising addition of another potential addressee; subsequently initiating the graphical user interface (GUI) element; and presenting the address menu as comprising contact information for the at least one potential addressee and the another potential addressee* (Grossman, 0059). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the graphical user interface of Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 11, *supra*).

As for dependent claim 16:

Grossman- Shavit suggests the *method of claim 11, further comprising: initiating presentation of a second user-selectable item associated with sending the outgoing electronic message to the first address and the second address in the address box* (Grossman, 0059 and 0060). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the graphical user interface of Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 11, *supra*).

As for dependent claim 17:

Grossman- Shavit suggests the *method of claim 16, further comprising: receiving a signal indicating a user selection of the second user-selectable item; and initiating communication of the outgoing message to the first address and the second address* (Grossman, 0053, 0059 and 0060). It would have been

Art Unit: 2175

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the graphical user interface of Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 11, *supra*).

As for dependent claim 18:

Grossman- Shavit suggests the *method of claim 17 further comprising attaching a file to the outgoing message* (Grossman, Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the graphical user interface of Grossman for the same reason as stated previously above (see claim 11, *supra*).

As for dependent claim 20:

Claim 20 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claim 11 and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

9. **Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman et al., US PG PUB# 2004/0119761 A1 (hereinafter Grossman) in view of Padwick, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2000" (hereinafter Padwick), and in further view of Landesmann, US# 7,072,943 B2.**

As for dependent claims 7 and 8:

Grossman teaches the above limitations (see claim 1, *supra*). Grossman shows/suggests a messaging system that has the ability to send messages to a plurality of communication type such as email address, instant messaging, facsimile, and telephone. Grossman further shows the messaging system have the ability to place a call to a desired contact. Grossman and Padwick does not specifically shows a *short messaging service address*, an *enhanced messaging service address*, and a *multimedia messaging service address* as communication type. However in the same field of invention Landesmann teaches a system which route email to a handheld device such as PDA or Cell phone (Landesmann, 6: 13-40). In addition an Official Notice is taken that communication type: *short messaging service address*, *an enhanced messaging service address*, and *a multimedia messaging service address* are well known in the art, such as shown by the following: (1) O'Neil et al, US# 7,127,232 R2 and (2) Shavit et al., US PG PUB#2002/0160757. Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2175

of the invention was made modify the system of Grossman and Padwick to incorporate routing email messages to a mobile device as taught by Landesmann, thus allowing the desired contact to receive messages through their handheld device (Landesmann, 6: 13-40)

10. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman et al., US PG PUB# 2004/0119761 A1 (hereinafter Grossman) in view of Padwick, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2000" (hereinafter Padwick) in view of Landesmann, US# 7,072,943 B2, and in further view of Fernandes, US# 6,014,135.**

As for dependent claim 9:

Grossman shows/suggests the above limitations (see claims 1, 7 and 8, *supra*). Grossman further shows/suggests the messaging system sharing file between the user and the desired contact (Fig. 4). Grossman, Padwick, and Landesmann do not specifically show the *system of claim 8, further comprising an attachment engine operable to convert a file attached to an outgoing message into a format receivable by a device associated with a messaging receipt option*. Fernandes teaches a messaging system which converts one message format type to another message type (Fernandes, 13: 45-53). Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Grossman, Padwick, and Landesmann to incorporate the converting message type function in a messaging system as taught by Fernandes, thus allowing the desired user to receive the intended message through various devices.

11. **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman et al., US PG PUB# 2004/0119761 A1 (hereinafter Grossman) in view of Shavit et al, US PG PUB# 2002/0160757 (hereinafter Shavit) in view of Fernandes, US# 6,014,135.**

As for dependent claim 19:

Grossman shows the above limitations (see claims 11, *supra*). Grossman further shows the messaging system sharing file between the user and the desired contact (Fig. 4). Grossman and Shavit do not specifically show the *method of claim 18 further comprising converting the file into a format receivable by a device associated with the first address*. Fernandes teaches a messaging system which converts one message format type to another message type (Fernandes, 13: 45-53). Accordingly it

Art Unit: 2175

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Grossman and Shavit to incorporate the converting message type function in a messaging system as taught by Fernandes, thus allowing the desired user to receive the intended message through various devices.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

The Examiner notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Further MPEP 2123, states that "a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicants' Remarks filed July 22nd, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Office refers applicants to MPEP 2123 and the last Office Action mailed on 03/13/2008 Pgs. 10 and 11, where the Office Action states the entire reference is cited and specific cited sections of the reference are not limiting in any way. Any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d

Art Unit: 2175

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968).

Regarding 35 USC § 103 rejection:

As for claims 1:

13. Applicants' argue *the cited portions of Grossman and Padwick fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Grossman and Padwick, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a plurality of address fields operable to maintain an address for a plurality of messaging receipt options wherein an outgoing message is formatted in a plurality of formats based upon the messaging receipt options, as recited in claim 1*

The Office respectfully disagrees.

14. The applicants argue new amended limitations that were not presented in the last mailed office action. It is noted that Grossman shows the limitations: *an address menu having an identification field with a plurality of associated address fields, each of the plurality of address fields operable to maintain an address for a plurality of messaging receipt options, wherein outgoing message is formatted in a plurality of formats based upon the messaging receipt options* in Figure 7 and Paragraphs 0053 and 0069. Fig. 7 and 0053 shows multiple address fields for a messaging receipt option. In Para. 0069 Grossman shows that the user may change the view of the outgoing communication history based on the type of communication. Furthermore Grossman shows a plurality of messaging options in Para. 0069. From the evidence set forth above, Grossman and Padwick shows all the limitations of claim 1 including: *an address menu having an identification field with a plurality of associated address fields, each of the*

Art Unit: 2175

plurality of address fields operable to maintain an address for a plurality of messaging receipt options, wherein outgoing message is formatted in a plurality of formats based upon the messaging receipt options.

As for claims 2-9, 13, 14 and 16-20:

15. With regard to claims 2-9, 13, 14 and 16-20 the applicants argue the same argument as presented above. Thus as indicated in the above discussion, the same rationale/rejection applies to dependent claims 2-9, 13, 14 and 16-20.

As for claim 11:

16. Applicants' argue *the cited portions of Grossman and Shavit, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest formatting an outgoing electronic message based upon a first address type for transmission to a first address and formatting the outgoing electronic message based upon a second address type for transmission to a second address.*

The Office respectfully disagrees.

17. The applicants argue new amended limitations that were not presented in the last mailed office action. As shown above on Pgs. 5 and 6 of this office action, it is noted that Grossman and Shavit suggests the limitations: *formatting an outgoing electronic message based upon a first address type for transmission to a first address and formatting the outgoing electronic message based upon a second address type for transmission to a second address.* Grossman does not specifically show (1) *the contact information including a first selectable address and a second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee* (2) *recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address;* (3) *initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message,* *wherein the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the first address type for transmission to the first address and the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the second address type for transmission to the second address.* In Paragraph 0053 and Fig. 7, Grossman shows multiple address fields for a messaging receipt option. In Paragraph 0069 Grossman shows that the user may change the view of the outgoing communication history based on the type of communication. Furthermore Grossman shows a plurality of messaging options in Para. 0069. In the

Art Unit: 2175

same field of invention Shavit teaches a contacts database which stores a list of addresses of a potential addressee (Shavit, 0034). Shavit allows the user to configure a priority table to send a message to a desired recipient with a plurality of addresses (Shavit, 0007). Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Grossman messaging system to incorporate (1) *the contact information including a first selectable address and a second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee* (2) *recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address;* (3) *initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message, wherein the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the first address type for transmission to the first address and the outgoing electronic message is formatted based upon the second address type for transmission to the second address* as taught by Shavit, thus allowing the user to send a message to a desired recipient with a plurality of addresses (Shavit, 0007).

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DP
/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Kieu D Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175